## JUNTA DE ANDALUCIA



<u>TAREA 1 - 14 puntos</u>: Read the text on page 3. Fill in each gap with the correct fragment from the list below. <u>Note that capital letters and punctuation marks have been removed</u>. There are TWO extra fragments you do not need to use. The first one (0) is an example. Use the box provided.

A.	also explains why some ethnic minorities
В.	are unconducive to child-rearing
C.	do not
D.	intended to test a number of hypotheses
E.	is far less likely
F.	is something they call field-specific ability
G.	it is equally true in the social sciences and humanities
Н.	looking for correlations
I.	playing down talent and emphasising hard work
J.	professors of maths and physics, among others
К.	raises interesting and awkward questions
L.	the lower will be the percentage of PhD students in that subject
M.	then plotted those numbers
N.	though men and women have the same relevant abilities on average
О.	through exposure to a culture that constantly tells them
P.	was there a correlation
Q.	will probably receive a short, sharp shock

GAP	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
ANSWER	G														
	~														

PUNTOS: / 14



### JUNTA DE ANDALUCIA

# PRUEBAS DE CERTIFICACIÓN 2016

#### **Beliefs and Brilliance**

Source: www.economist.com

It is a long time since the groves of academe were paced only by men, but even now some of them are more populated by women than others are. The reason is a mystery. Although the phenomenon is most discussed in scientific and technological disciplines (in the USA, new PhDs in maths and physics are earned mostly by men, while half of those in molecular biology and neuroscience are awarded to women), \_\_(0) where art history and psychology are dominated by women, and economics and philosophy by men.

Various explanations have been advanced. That the long hours required for laboratory work <u>1</u> is one. A second is that those subjects in which women are rarest require habits of systematic thought found (it is claimed by some) more often in men. A third is that, <u>2</u>, the statistical distribution of these may be wider in men than women. Suggesting this latter possibility in 2005 helped cost Larry Summers, then president of Harvard, his job, for the subject is political dynamite.

A paper just published in *Science* suggests that prejudice is to blame. Moreover, it is a prejudice which, they think, <u>3</u>, black people in particular, are under-represented in a similar way. The paper's authors, led by Sarah-Jane Leslie of Princeton university and Andrei Cimpian of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, hypothesise that the crucial variable <u>4</u> (basically, innate talent)—or, rather, a belief in this quality by those already entrenched in a discipline. They have found that the more professors think some special talent beyond intelligence and hard work is required to do their subject well, <u>5</u> who are women.

Dr Leslie and Dr Cimpian established this by sending questionnaires to more than 1,800 academics working in 30 fields, from astronomy to sociology, at American universities. They asked questions <u>6</u> explaining the gender differences between disciplines, converted the responses into numbers, and <u>7</u> against the fraction of female PhD students enrolled in the disciplines concerned, <u>8</u>. The questions focussed on the importance of long hours, systematic thought, the particular field and their own natural talent.

Only in the case of academics' assessments of the need for innate talent 9 — and, as the first two charts show, it was strong. The results on race, illustrated in the third and fourth chart, are also intriguing. Black PhD students show the same types of correlation as women. Americans of Asian descent 10.

All this <u>11</u>. It may be unpalatable to some, but the idea that males and females have evolved cognitive differences over the course of many millions of years, because of the different interests of the sexes, is plausible. That people of different races have evolved such differences <u>12</u>, given the youth of *Homo sapiens* as a species. Prejudice thus seems a more plausible explanation for what Dr Leslie and Dr Cimpian have observed. But prejudice can work in subtle ways.

These differences may reflect the prejudices of recruiters themselves. But it may also be that women and black people themselves, <u>13</u> (which research suggests it does) that they do not have an aptitude for things like maths and physics, have come to believe this is true. If that is the case (and Dr Leslie and Dr Cimpian suspect it is), it suggests that a cultural shift in schools and universities, <u>14</u>, might serve to broaden the intake of currently male-dominated and black-deficient fields, to the benefit of all.



# soluciones

## **TAREA 1: Beliefs and Brilliance** (1 punto cada respuesta correcta) 1) B 2) N 3) A 4) F 5) L 6) D 7) M 8) H 9) P 10) C 11) K 12) E 13) O 14) I

# TAREA 2: Achilles' Heel of Capitalism (2 puntos cada respuesta correcta)

- 1) B
- 2) A
- 3) B
- 4) C
- 5) A
- 6) A
- 7) B
- 8) B